

Serial No. 09/937,367

### Remarks

#### Status of Claims

Claims 22 and 36 have been rejected under 35 USC102(b) for lack of novelty over Kivi-Mannila.

Claims 23, 35, 37 have been rejected under 35 USC103(a) for obviousness over Kivi-Mannila in view of G.803.

Claims 24, 38 have been rejected under 35 USC103(a) for obviousness over Kivi-Mannila in view of G.803 in view of Kosugi.

Claims 25, 26 and 40 have been rejected under 35 USC103(a) for obviousness over Kivi-Mannila in view of admitted Prior Art.

Claim 28 has been rejected under 35 USC103(a) over Kivi-Mannila in view of Prior Art, and in further view of G.803.

Claim 29 has been rejected under 35 USC103(a) as being unpatentable over Kivi-Mannila in view of Prior Art, and in further view of G.803, and further in view of Kosugi.

Claims 30 and 39 have been rejected under 35 USC103(a) over Kivi-Mannila in view of Takatori.

The Examiner has objected to claims 27, 31 to 34 and 41 as being dependent on a rejected base claim, but indicated that such claims would be allowable if rewritten in independent form.

#### Claim 22

Claim 22 is limited by combination with claims 25 and 27 so as to clearly distinguish over the cited art. Claim 22 is distinguished at least by the features of previous claim 27. This is broadly in line with the Examiner's indication of patentable subject matter.

#### Dependent claims 23 to 35

Claims 25 and 27 are canceled.

Claims 26 and 28 are amended so as to bring their dependencies into line with the amended claims.

Claims 23 to 24, 26 and 28 to 35 are each patentable not least on the basis that they depend on an allowable amended claim 22.

#### Claim 36

Independent claim 36 is amended by combination with claim 41 in accordance with the Examiner's indication of allowable subject matter.

#### Claims 37 to 41

Claim 41 is canceled.

Serial No. 09/937,367

Claims 37 to 40 are each patentable not least on the basis that they depend on an allowable amended claim 36.

New Claims 42 and 43


New claim 42 is enclosed being a combination of claims 22, 30 and 31 in accordance with the Examiner's indication of allowable subject matter.

New claim 43 is enclosed being a combination of claims 22, 30 and 34 in accordance with the Examiner's indication of allowable subject matter.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, allowance of all the claims presently in the application is respectfully requested, as is passage to issuance of the application. If the Examiner should feel that the application is not yet in a condition for allowance and that a telephone interview would be useful, he is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney at 732 949 1857.

Respectfully,

By   
Eugene J. Rosenthal, Attorney  
Reg. No. 36,658  
732-949-1857

Lucent Technologies Inc.

Date: 12/23/05